



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Path to Peace.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

Reprinted from the London Times of June 19, 1909, and issued as a leaflet by the Peace Society of the City of New York.

Your New York correspondent advised you by wire of the proceedings of meetings of the Peace Societies of New York and Chicago, which called upon our President to exert his influence for peace and "especially to secure an agreement among the powers for a speedy arrest of the ruinous competition of armaments now prevailing."

The New York meeting suggested his inviting a conference of the powers, which I, as president of the Society, approved, but I am bound to say that subsequent travel in Europe has modified my views. It is not from America, but from Britain, such invitation should come.

Wherever one travels upon the continent to-day the chief subject of conversation among intelligent men is the British Dreadnaught and its consequences. Dreadnaughts might and probably would have been introduced sooner or later by another nation than Britain, but, unfortunately for her, they were not. It is the British Dreadnaught the people hear of in other countries, and she alone is blamed for the serious consequences flowing from its introduction.

There seems no possibility of preventing the other naval powers from following the example of Britain and Germany, and although our industrial republic has nothing to covet and has repeatedly refused to give the Executive more than one-half the battleships demanded, it may be impossible to prevent even her from increasing her fleet rapidly like the others. Thus no power will gain much in naval strength over another, for relatively their positions will remain substantially as before. These enlarged navies, instead of tending to ensure peace, will increase the danger of war.

What a strange spectacle the naval powers present to-day! Go where one will, he hears the men in power lamenting the necessity forced upon them for increasing armaments, one after the other explaining that they must increase their navy, and this only for "protection."

The Emperor of Germany and Prince Von Buelow urge nothing for their increased armaments except "protection" for their commerce and their coasts.

The latter addressed the following message to the British ministers of the Prince of Peace:

"I sincerely hope that our guests and Christian brethren will bring the conviction home and publish the fact that there is living on this side of the North Sea a peaceful and laborious people which heartily desires, as well as its government, to live peacefully in friendship and neighborliness with its brethren beyond the Channel."

Not a voice is raised in Britain except for needed protection from assault. So with the good men of France. So with Austria and Italy. So with President Taft, who recently wrote:

"The policy of the United States in avoiding war under all circumstances except those plainly inconsistent with honor or its highest welfare has been made so clear to the world as hardly to need statement at my hands. I can only say that so far as my legitimate influence extends while at the head of this government, it will always be exerted to the full in favor of peace, not only as between this country and other countries, *but as between our sister nations.*" [*Italics are mine.*]

One leader is more insistent than another that his country's aim is to secure peace, the only end it has in view. If this be untrue, there is not an Emperor, King, President, or Prime Minister in the world to-day who does not perjure himself every now and then, protesting that his country desires nothing but to live in neighborly friendship with all others.

Are these public men, who have risen to eminence and enjoy the confidence of their fellow-countrymen, perjuring themselves? No, far from this; they speak the sober truth from the heart. They feel what they utter. The desire for peace is genuine. "Give us peace in our time, O Lord," is the prayer of civilized nations and rulers. Ambassador Bryce, speaking at the Peace Conference in America, corroborates this. He says:

"Every nation is conscious of its own rectitude of purpose and believes its armaments are for its own safety and will not be used aggressively."

This being accepted, unfounded suspicion must be the root of all this trouble. Every additional battleship tends to convert suspicion in neighboring nations into hatred, and then a misinterpreted word, movement or accident, which would otherwise have been easily explained, becomes the cause of war. For war usually arises not directly from the possession of armaments by a nation, but from the suspicions aroused in neighboring nations by the creation of these armaments. Hence the impossibility of increased armaments being conducive to peace. Suspicion, fear, hatred, and hence the danger of war, increase in compound ratio as armaments increase.

It is the old story: two neighbors have a slight misunderstanding which mutual explanations would readily have dispelled, but one in an unguarded moment says to the other, "I'll make you behave like a gentleman." "You can't do it," is the ready response. One decides to buy a pistol, not for use, but solely for "protection" if attacked. Hearing this, the other feels he must have "protection" also. The first substitutes a six-chambered revolver, just to be dead certain of protection. The other follows, just to be dead certain also. If the insurance company knew of this misunderstanding the life premiums of these two citizens would rise in geometrical progression with each added weapon. Fortunately the law in civilized nations, founded upon experience which shows that a hundred deadly feuds occur where men go armed to one where it is prohibited, steps in and prohibits private armaments and punishes the law-breakers. Britain and France played the part of the foolish neighbors fifty years ago. To-day it is Britain and Germany.

Nearly a century ago (1817), Canada and America agreed that upon the inland seas, which constitute their boundary for hundreds of miles, each should place one one-hundred-ton vessel armed with one twenty-eight-pounder. The tiny craft, one flying the Union Jack and the other the Stars and Stripes, have never fired a shot except in friendly salute to each other, and unbroken peace has been preserved. If the world had its police force on the seas, there would be the "protection from assault," which each naval power declares it only desires and is increasing its navy solely to ensure. There would remain no enemy from whom "protection" was needed. Commerce would be immune. The naval nations would be as one in friendly alliance.

Our English-speaking race has developed parliamentary

government, abolished the last vestige of human slavery from civilized lands, was first to abolish private war between men, and was also prominent in abolishing piracy upon the seas. Why should Britain as the foremost naval power and the motherland of our race hesitate to invite the other naval powers to confer with a view to peace, and as a means of securing it suggest that they combine in abolishing war upon the seas, following the British-American example? Let this be freely discussed with other suggestions. There is nothing startling or new in this plan. It would follow a highly successful precedent covering a century. Three or four powers could be named which, united to-day to ensure peace upon the seas, would be sufficient, but many more would respond to Britain's call. Surely, few, if any, would decline. Why should they? How could they, their aim being peace, as they all proclaim? Those who declined would reveal themselves the enemies of mankind. The peaceful powers accepting might so greatly preponderate as to see their way to form a League of Peace, and ships of war, except the few needed for police duty, would be unneeded, just as they have long been and are to-day upon the inland seas of North America, and would be left to rust at their docks. No nation would commit itself to anything by accepting an invitation to a conference. Any action taken could be made subject to ratification by the governments.

So easy the solution seems that to many it may appear unworthy of consideration. But great crises have usually easy solutions because, being the product of grave mistakes or great wrongs, total reversal of the policy pursued is what is needed. Here is the key to the present situation. There is nothing speculative about this proved solution of the very question which disturbs the nations to-day. Though it may be rejected now, the day will nevertheless come, and that I believe soon, when this stone which the builders reject shall become the head of the corner. It has proved itself the panacea for war upon the seas.

Has our race lost the breed of great statesmen, or is there to-day a Prime Minister and Cabinet in Britain composed of men who dare be great and thus lead the nations out of bondage to the false god of war, becoming the foremost body of statesmen of all time by having rendered mankind the greatest service? Or is such an invitation to the powers to be the beneficent act of others more zealous in the cause of peace?

Even to attempt and fail for the time in such a cause would give to the participants lasting place among those whom coming generations are to hold in honor.

The policy of conciliation pursued by Britain has recently proved its claims to favor by brilliant successes, both in South Africa and in India. She is entitled to adopt as her motto, and none is so well adapted to the present crisis, "First, all means to conciliate," Britain has also won favor in other lands by the calm, firm moderation displayed by her government and its refusal to be stampeded into unnecessary armaments, which would only add fuel to the flame abroad, and when for years to come its naval supremacy is perfectly secure. It has avoided bluster and maintained a dignified reserve.

Mr. Editor, in all truth and soberness, it should no longer be permissible for any two powers in jealous rivalry to build Dreadnaughts contingent upon what each

other may do, thus compelling all other naval powers to follow their ruinous and, in this the twentieth century, saddening example, or to become defenseless.

This is no mere German-British affair. It is a world-wide issue, and the next step, momentous as it may prove for good or evil, is apparently for Britain to take, as the inventor and first adopter of the Dreadnaught.

Whatever the final result, if Britain played the part of peacemaker, as suggested, she would have the moral support of the enlightened public sentiment of the world with her, a tower of strength. If repulsed, she would have her quarrel just. It is not for any non-citizen to advise; she will choose her own path; certain it is, however, she could play no nobler part nor one that would redound in history more to her honor and glory, illustrious as that history is, for henceforth it is the triumphs of peace through conciliation, not those of brutal war through the slaughter of our fellowmen, that are to make nations venerated in after ages.

I write as one who loves his native land.

Interdependence vs. Independence of Nations.

BY PROF. PAUL S. REINSCH OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

Address delivered at the Second National Peace Congress, Chicago, May 3, 1909.

It is one of the laws of human beings that, scarce achieving what we have striven for with might and main, we are again beckoned farther by new goals and more distant aims. For the past six centuries humanity has been working to establish nationalism — to found nations, to cement their elements into a potent unity, to concentrate their forces, to build up in all their majesty the powerful societies of to-day. They are the protectors of all we hold dear in civilization. It is not surprising that achievements demanding such efforts and sacrifices should be looked upon as the ultimate form of society. They render life rich and colored through the variety of customs and ideas which they maintain. They prevent dull uniformity; they give the human spirit a chance to manifest all its inherent possibilities of expression and life and art. Small wonder that conservative spirits look upon national life and independence as the last word of civilization. And yet we are on all hands surrounded by the unmistakable evidences that this, too, is a transitory stage — that civilization cannot content itself with a partial organization, but is tending irresistibly towards universalism.

The generous ideal of world unity and peace is still looked upon by many practical men as a golden dream. Even the president of the second Hague Peace Conference spoke of it as "the bright star of universal peace which we shall never reach, but which will always guide us." The cosmopolitan ideal has indeed in the past been often displayed in a form that had little connection with living men and institutions. It has set up an abstract conception of humanity by which men were supposed to be directly impelled and actuated towards world unity. The national state was looked upon as an obstacle. War was personified into an evil entity that must be combated directly and subdued by inhibition, as demons and monsters were exorcised in ages past. Such abstractions